



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,920	07/07/2000	David J. Lindner	2007.0012900	7765

7590 05/20/2004

JONATHAN M HARRIS
CONELY ROSE & TAYON
P O BOX 3267
HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/611,920

Applicant(s)

LINDNER, DAVID J.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 7/7/00.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cluet, Sophie, Olga Kapitskaia, and Divesh Srivastava, "Using LDAP Directory Caches", ACM database, May1999 in view of Luotonen, US 5,864,852, 1/26/99.

In reference to claim 1, Cluet teaches the use of LDAP directory caches. Cluet's system teaches that in order to achieve fast performance and high availability in LDAP network directories, it is desirable to cache information. See page 273. While Cluet does not delve into the details of the LDAP directory cache; Luotonen provides some insight. Luotonen teaches a system in which when a client requests a document, a proxy server determines if the file contained in the cache is up-to-date and delivers the document to the user if it is. If it is not up-to-date, the proxy server then it retrieves information from the origin server (directory server). See column 1, lines 39-50.

Compare to ***"determining if an application is requesting information from the directory server; determining if the requested information is stored in the caching***

daemon in response to determining that the application has requested information; and sending the requested information to the application.” Luotonen further cites another caching proxy server, the Harvest Cache Daemon, see column 2, lines 9-15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cluet and Luotonen since both are concerned with providing a cache daemon with a directory server to improve performance as providing caching helps achieve fast performance and high availability. See page 273 or Cluet and column 1, lines 25-35 of Luotonen.

In reference to claim 2, Cluet teaches that the directory server is linked to a variety of network-based applications that store data and providing a cache storing those entries provides for efficient delivery of documents. Thus the directory server is not limited in its connections between various applications and a caching daemon. See page 273.

In reference to claims 3-5, Luotonen teaches that when a client requests a document, a proxy server determines if the file contained in the cache is up-to-date and delivers the document to the user if it is. If it is not up-to-date, the proxy server then it retrieves information from the origin server (directory server). See column 1, lines 39-50. Thus if the document were not stored in the cache originally, the proxy would then retrieve it from the remote server (directory server). The information is then stored in the proxy for future requests. See column 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cluet and Luotonen since both are concerned with providing a cache daemon with a directory server to improve

performance as providing caching helps achieve fast performance and high availability.

See page 273 or Cluet and column 1, lines 25-35 of Luotonen.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under the same rationale used in reference to claims 1-5 respectively above.

In reference to claims 6 and 8, Cluet teaches the use of LDAP directory caches. Cluet's system teaches that in order to achieve fast performance and high availability in LDAP network directories, it is desirable to cache information. See page 273. While Cluet does not delve into the details of the LDAP directory cache; Luotonen provides some insight. Luotonen teaches a system in which when a client requests a document, a proxy server determines if the file contained in the cache is up-to-date and delivers the document to the user if it is. If it is not up-to-date, the proxy server then it retrieves information from the origin server (directory server). See column 1, lines 39-50.

Compare to ***"a directory server for storing information; and a caching daemon adapted to establish a first plurality of connections to the directory server, determine if an application is requesting information from the directory server, determine if the requested information is stored within the caching daemon; and send the requested information to the application."*** Luotonen further cites another caching proxy server, the Harvest Cache Daemon, see column 2, lines 9-15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cluet and Luotonen since both are concerned with providing a cache daemon with a directory server to improve performance as providing caching helps achieve fast

performance and high availability. See page 273 or Cluet and column 1, lines 25-35 of Luotonen.

In reference to claim 7, Cluet teaches that the directory server is linked to a variety of network-based applications that store data and providing a cache storing those entries provides for efficient delivery of documents. Thus the directory server is not limited in its connections between various applications and a caching daemon. See page 273.

In reference to claims 9 and 10, Luotonen teaches that when a client requests a document, a proxy server determines if the file contained in the cache is up-to-date and delivers the document to the user if it is. If it is not up-to-date, the proxy server then it retrieves information from the origin server (directory server). See column 1, lines 39-50. Thus if the document were not stored in the cache originally, the proxy would then retrieve it from the remote server (directory server). The information is then stored in the proxy for future requests. See column 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cluet and Luotonen since both are concerned with providing a cache daemon with a directory server to improve performance as providing caching helps achieve fast performance and high availability. See page 273 or Cluet and column 1, lines 25-35 of Luotonen.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 6 and 7 respectively above.

In reference to claims 18-20, Luotonen teaches that when a client requests a document, a proxy server determines if the file contained in the cache is up-to-date and

delivers the document to the user if it is. If it is not up-to-date, the proxy server then it retrieves information from the origin server (directory server). See column 1, lines 39-50. Thus if the document were not stored in the cache originally, the proxy would then retrieve it from the remote server (directory server). The information is then stored in the proxy for future requests. See column 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cluet and Luotonen since both are concerned with providing a cache daemon with a directory server to improve performance as providing caching helps achieve fast performance and high availability. See page 273 of Cluet and column 1, lines 25-35 of Luotonen.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Cluet article's caching is performed by a client machine and the caching itself appears to be done to reduce client server communications. Cluet's system teaches that it is desirable to cache information in LDAP network directories to achieve fast performance, etc. Cluet teaches that a client cache stores a subset of the data available at the directory server. Luotonen was utilized in the rejections to illustrate the coupling of the proxy server and remote server. See figure 1 and rejections above.

Applicant further argues that Luotonen fails to teach that the specific directory structure and mapping mechanism disclosed for URLs could be applicable to a LDAP directory. Applicant's claims are directed to accessing a directory server comprising

connections between the server and a caching daemon. The claimed invention does not apply specifically to a LDAP directory but rather a directory server, thus Examiner maintains position that Cluet in view of Luotonen teaches the invention. See rejections above.

Applicant also argues that Luotonen fails to teach any specifics regarding the logical coupling between the proxy server and the remote server. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Luotonen teaches a system in which a proxy server retrieves information from a directory server. The proxy server is diagramed in figure 1. It is clear from this figure that the proxy server (14) and the remote server (16) are logically coupled. See column 1, lines 39-50.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2176

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

RS
5/10/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER